



ZONING/LAND DEVELOPMENT REWRITE SOUNDING BOARD MEETING

MINUTES

January 23, 2013
6:30 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Minutes: All members were present except Rick Holland and Max Lehmann.

B. MINUTES

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from December 17, 2012 Meeting.

Robert Wittenstein moved to approve the minutes from December 17, 2012. Jim Redovian seconded. The motion was voted and passed (5-0).

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Discussion of Supermodule (1-3) of the Zoning/Land Development Code Rewrite.

Minutes: Steve Dush introduced Drew Cutright, the supermodule, and meeting topics. He explained the process for future public meetings.

The Board discussed various aspects of Supermodule (1-3).

Apartments in O-I Zoning Districts: The Board discussed making multi-unit residential buildings in O-I districts legally non-conforming. After discussion, the Board concluded to task the consultant with developing multiple solutions for review at next meeting.

CR-1 District in Overlay: The Board discussed conflicts in permitting/ restricting certain uses in the Commercial-Residential Mixed-Use zoning district. Ultimately, it was decided that modifications must comply with the new SLUP process.

Community Gardens: Members of the Board discussed terminology in terms of what is to be considered a ☐structure☐ and how it relates to setbacks. Determined that ☐actual☐ structures should be regulated through setbacks, however,

plant beds should be allowed wherever.

Residential Infill: The Board debated the pros and cons of creating more flexible regulations. The Board decided to proceed with the current regulations and decide if they are successful at a future update.

Home Occupations: Members of the Board voiced concerns about calling out certain uses and limitations placed on possible home occupations. After discussion, everyone agreed the new code should not call out specific uses. Additionally, it was determined that "customer" refers to number of cars, thus allowing multiple people in the home at one time.

Garage Sales: The Board discussed the restriction of limiting sales to two per calendar year. The Board deemed it appropriate.

Bike Parking: Members of the Board felt the incentive program was too mild and desired a bigger break. The Board decided that additional parking requirements needed to be omitted.

Cross-District Access: Board Members showed concern about regulation consistency throughout the section. The consultant suggested reconciling issues with other sections.

Planning Commission's Ability to Defer: The Board debated the pros and cons of the planning commission having the ability to defer and issue. After discussion, the Board agreed that super-majority must be required and the commission should be limited to only one deferral per cycle.

After discussing the hot topics for the meeting, a general, round-table discussion ensued, involving manufactured houses. It was discussed that standards need to be met without preventing their use.

D. ADJOURN